

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-10, and 12-37 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, 18, 24, 28, and 34 are amended. This Amendment is supported by the specification as published at least at paragraphs [0002] and [0009].

I. Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7, 9, 10, and 12-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Beard (U.S. Patent No. 7,245,725) in view of England (U.S. Patent No. 7,137,004) and further in view of Hennessey (U.S. Patent No. 7,450,524). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Beard, England, Hennessey, either alone or combined, do not disclose or render obvious the method including at least receiving, with a first processor, data for use in an operation in a second processor, the first processor being an applications processor including cryptographic and security capabilities that are excluded in the second processor, the second processor being a wireless communications processor and verifying, with the first processor, a credibility of the data for the second processor by validating that the data is sent from a trusted source by public and private keys, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 9, 18, 24, 28, and 34.

Beard discloses a dual processor framer including a receiver and a transmitter which share common circuitry and/or code (see Abstract and Fig. 1 of Beard). In Beard, a first and second processors share common components including a header error correction (HEC) and cyclic redundancy check (CRC) mechanisms that are used to detect common errors caused by noise in transmission channels. However, the HEC/CRC mechanisms do not provide cryptographic and security capabilities. Thus, none of the processors in Beard include cryptographic and security capabilities.

Further, both of the processors in Beard are used for providing simultaneous communication between multiple channels (see col. 4, lines 20-26 of Beard). Thus, Beard does not teach one of the two processors being an applications processor while the other processor being a wireless communications processor. Moreover, in Beard, the two processors share *common* circuitry and/or code, and thus the first processor does not include circuitry (e.g., cryptographic and security capabilities) that are excluded in the second processor.

The Office Action admits that Beard does not disclose verifying, with the first processor, a credibility of the data for the second processor by validating that the data is sent from a trusted source, but asserts that Hennessey teaches the feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees as explained below.

In particular, Hennessey teaches a distributed computing system for determining network topology in a peer-to-peer network including a directory server (see Fig. 1 of Hennessey). The directory server 104 in Fig. 2 of Hennessey includes trace evaluation module 220 that can sort the addresses of all the routers and analyze the list of addresses (see Fig. 2 and col. 5, lines 7-25 of Hennessey). The trace evaluation module 220 uses statistical approach to determine which routers and peers are more or less likely to be trustworthy by assigning weights based on their past behavior information.

As such, the trace evaluation module 220 can only reduce the probability of using routers and peers that are not trustworthy, and thus is not designed to offer cryptographic and security capabilities based on public and private keys. In other words, the trace evaluation measure 220 of Hennessey cannot validate that the data is sent from a trusted source but at the most may reduce the probability of the data being sent from a source that is not trustworthy. Thus, Hennessey does not disclose verifying, with the first processor, a credibility of the data for the

second processor by validating that the data is sent from a trusted source by public and private keys. England also does not disclose or render obvious this feature.

Furthermore, there is no motivation to combine the features of Hennessey and Beard. Specifically, Hennessey concerns determining network topology in a peer-to-peer network in a broadband communications environment (see col. 1, lines 15-59 of Hennessey). Hennessey addresses a method and apparatus that uses information about network topology in selecting servers to deliver content. Whereas, Beard concerns application of multiple processors in wireless data communication devices. Thus, an ordinary skilled person in the art would have no motivation to combine the features of the two references, for example, combining directory server 104 of Hennessey with the dual processor framer of Beard. Even if combined, it would not yield the feature recited in claim 1.

In view of the above, Beard, England, Hennessey, neither alone or combined, do not disclose or render obvious at least receiving, with a first processor, data for use in an operation in a second processor, the first processor being an applications processor including cryptographic and security capabilities that are excluded in the second processor, the second processor being a wireless communications processor and verifying, with the first processor, a credibility of the data for the second processor by validating that the data is sent from a trusted source by public and private keys, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 9, 18, 24, 28, and 34.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, 18, 24, 28, and 34 are allowable. Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1; claims 10 and 12-17 depend from claim 9; claims 19-23 depend from claim 18; claims 25-27 depend from claim 24; claims 29-33 depend from claim 28; and claims 35-37 depend from claim 34, and are therefore also allowable by

virtue of their dependence, as well as for the additional features that they recite. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 10, and 12-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-7, 9, 10, and 12-37 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Andy N. Kim
Registration No. 61,050

JAO:ANK/hs

Attachment: Request for Continued Examination

Date: September 3, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--